REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 15, 2003, with claims 1-13, all of which remain pending. Claims 1, 5 and 10 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0065656 (hereinafter "Reding").

Claims 4, 8, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,832 (hereinafter "Saylor").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons set forth in their previous response, which is incorporated by reference herein.

Notwithstanding the traversal, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5 and 10 without prejudice, solely in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to set forth that the first specification comprises a first voiceprint description received from a first application, with the first voiceprint description identifying a first subset of stored voice recordings to be utilized by the voice print generator to generate the first voiceprint. Also, the voice print generator is further operative to generate a second voiceprint responsive to a second specification comprising a second voiceprint description received from a second application different than the first application, the second voiceprint description identifying a second subset of the stored voice recordings, different than the first subset, to be utilized by the voice print generator to generate the second voiceprint. Finally, the claim as amended recites that the first and second voiceprints are generated on demand by the voice print generator from the stored voice recordings responsive to the respective first and second voiceprint descriptions received from the respective first and second applications.

Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 5 and 10.

Dependent claim 3 has been amended to maintain consistency with amended claim 1.

Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at, for example, pages 4-6, paragraphs [0015] to [0019], and pages 7-8, paragraphs [0023] to [0024].

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments made herein are not made for reasons relating to patentability over Reding, Saylor and the other cited art. For the reasons set forth in the

previous response, the claims as previously presented are believed to distinguish patentably over the cited art. More particularly, the collective teachings of the cited art fail to teach or suggest arrangements for on-demand generation of voiceprints responsive to received specifications referencing stored voice recordings.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-13 as amended are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 22, 2008 Joseph B. Ryan

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 37,922

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP

90 Forest Avenue

Locust Valley, NY 11560

(516) 759-7517